



## REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ziemer. The applicant has canceled this claim, while preserving the right to prosecute this claim at a future date.

The Examiner rejected claims 21, 23, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hellenkamp in view of Dybbs. The Examiner rejected claims 22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hellenkamp, in view of Dybbs, in further view of Richey. The Examiner rejected claims 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hellenkamp, in view of Cohn. Independent claims 21 and 24 have been amended to recite a slot that is located in a front surface of a blade holder and which receives a rear edge of the blade. The slot is different from the hole which is used to introduce the bonding agent that is attached to the blade holder and blade. Even assuming that Dybbs or Cohn teach to modify Hellenkamp to include an adhesive, the adhesive applied by Dybbs and Cohn would be in the same hole that receives the blade. Neither reference discloses or suggests to introduce a bonding agent through a hole that is different than the aperture which receives or otherwise engages the blade.


Additionally, the arrangement of the blade and blade holder recited in the claims is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art. The claims recite a slot located in the front surface of a blade holder which receives the blade. As discussed throughout the above-entitled application, such a configuration allows the blade to be calibrated to an accurate dimension between the front surface of the blade holder and the front edge of the blade. Once calibrated, the bonding agent can be introduced through the hole of the blade holder to affix or further affix the blade to the blade holder. This is to be distinguished from the

Hellenkamp and Dybbs references which disclose a blade assembly where the blade is attached to the bottom surface of the blade holder by some type of protrusion that is inserted into a blade aperture. Such a configuration does not allow the manufacturer to move the blade relative to the blade holder during assembly to accurately calibrate the cutting edge of the blade. The tolerances between the hole of the blade and the edge of the blade, and the protrusion of the blade holder and the front surface of the blade holder, will vary the distance between the front surface of the blade holder and the cutting edge, and thus change the cutting depth of the blade. None of these references disclose a blade that is attached to a slot located in a front surface of a blade holder. For all of the above reasons the applicant submits that the prior art does not render obvious claims 21-26.

In view of the above it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 21-26 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
IRELL & MANELLA, LLP


Dated: March 4, 2004

  
BEN J. YORKS  
Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
949-760-0991

**Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is sent via U.S. First Class Mail addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 4, 2004.

  
Wendy Jones  
Date 3/4/04